



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/624,445	07/24/2000	Stephen Uhler	P5297/RSH	5723

23600 7590 04/10/2003

COUDERT BROTHERS LLP
333 SOUTH HOPE STREET
23RD FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90071

EXAMINER

ANYA, CHARLES E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2126

6

DATE MAILED: 04/10/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/624,445

Applicant(s)

UHLER ET AL.

Examiner

Charles E Anya

Art Unit

2126

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 August 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

Claim 14 is objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 14 includes the phrase "A method of creating a creating an extensible application web framework comprising". The Examiner would change the phrase to read as follows "A method of creating an extensible application web framework comprising".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The applicant recites "The computer program product of claim 18" in claim 18 and "The computer program product of claim 19" in claim 19 which are inappropriate dependencies. The Examiner would assume that claims 18 and 19 depend on claim 17.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the

Art Unit: 2126

applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat.

No. 6,144,990 to Brandt et al.

As to claim 20, Brandt teaches a Device (Computer System 340/FlowMark 450 Col. 13 Ln. 28 – 47), an HTTP Request (“URL...” Col. 12 Ln. 51 – 67, Col. 16 Ln. 1 – 3), a Requester (Web Browser 212 Col. 12 Ln. 51 – 67), extracting request in from the HTTP request (Col. 12 Ln. 66 – 67, Col. 13 Ln. 1 – 8), Command (“command...” Col. 13 Ln. 1 – 53), a Handler Object (FMIG 430 Col. 13 Ln. 14 – 22), invoking the commands on the device (Col. 13 Ln. 34 – 43), receiving device information from the device (“receive...” Col. 13 Ln. 43 – 47) and returning device information to the requester (Col. 14 Ln. 10 – 32).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1 – 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,233,622 to Atsatt et al. in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,529,936 B1 to Mayo et al.

As to claim 1, Atsatt teaches an extensible application web framework (“extension...” Col. 2 Ln. 37 – 51), a Server Object (Web Demon 20 Col. 3 Ln. 1 – 67,

Adapter 22 Col. 3 Ln. 11 – 54), a Web Application (Server 16 Col. 3 Ln. 1 – 67), a Request Object (Request Object 26 Col. 4 Ln. 28 – 67), at least one or more handler objects (Handler 24 (24a, 24b, 24c) Col. 3 Ln. 19 – 67, Col. 4 Ln. 1 – 67).

Atsatt is silent with reference to a properties object.

Mayo teaches a Properties Object (Objects 32 – 32n, Object 50 Col. 7 Ln. 20 – 67, Col. 8 Ln. 1 – 67, Col. 9 Ln. 1 – 13). It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Mayo to the system of Atsatt. One would have been motivated to make such modification to provide a unit of distribution for the objects (Col. 7 Ln. 61 – 67).

As to claim 2, Although an initialization method and a handler name is not explicitly taught these limitations are inherent because in order for the handler object to process a request resources (e.g. memory), it must have to be allocated to the handler object and the handler object inherently has an identifier otherwise it would be impossible for the adapter object to pass the request object to the handler object.

As to claim 3, Atsatt teaches the step of the handler object creating/instantiating additional handler objects (IRemoteHandler Col. 10 Ln. 1 – 9).

As to claim 4 Atsatt teaches the request object as adapted to obtain and parse the server request (Col. 4 Ln. 31 – 67).

As to claim 5, Atsatt teaches request object as containing information related to a server request (Col. 4 Ln. 31 – 35).

As to claim 6, Atsatt is silent reference to altering the properties object.

Art Unit: 2126

Mayo teaches altering the properties object (Col. 9 Ln. 11 – 13). It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Mayo to the system of Atsatt. One would have been motivated to make such modification to promote code reuse (Col. 9 Ln. 11 – 13).

As to claim 7, Atsatt teaches the step of creating a server object (Col. 9 Ln. 16 – 25), the step of creating a handler object (Col. 4 Ln. 12 – 17, Block 36 Col. 5 Ln. 1 – 7), receiving an indication of a request (Col. 3 Ln. 37 – 47), creating a request object in response to receiving the indication (Col. 4 Ln. 31 – 35: NOTE: Atsatt does not explicitly show the step of creating a request object in response to receiving the indication however this is inherent because the adapter receives the input data before the creation of a request object), a response method (Block 46 Col. 5 Ln. 37 – 41) and the step of calling methods of the request object to obtain the request at the port (Col. 4 Ln. 46 – 50: NOTE: A port is inherent because the URLs includes port number that a web server is running on). And see the rejection of claim 1.

As to claim 8, see the rejection of claim 3.

As to claim 9, claim 7 meets claim 9 except for the step of waiting for a request for aggregated content.

Atsatt is silent with reference to this limitation, however, Atsatt teaches IRemoteHandler that could forward requests to a second handler object (Col. 10 Ln. 1 – 9). By some doing the handler object would be chained and as the response is returned along the chain an aggregate content would be accumulated.

As to claim 10, see the rejection of claims 3 and 9.

As to claim 11, see the rejection of claims 3 and 9.

As to claim 12, see the rejection of claim 6.

As to claim 13, see the rejection of claims 3 and 9.

As to claim 14, see the rejection of claim 1.

As to claim 15, Atsatt teaches the step where a handler object is called to respond to a request embodied in the request object (Col. 4 Ln. 42 – 50).

As to claim 16, claims 3 and 9 meets claim 16 except for the step of exchanging information via the properties object. For this limitation see the rejection of claims 3 and 9.

As to claim 17, see the rejection of claim 1.

As to claim 18, see the rejection of claims 3 and 9.

As to claim 19, claim 6 meets claim 19 except for responding to requests based on the properties object.

Mayo teaches the step of responding to requests based on the properties object (“property-name...” Col. 8 Ln. 7 – 18). It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Mayo to the system of Atsatt. One would have been motivated to make such modification to determine the interface to a function that a request would be routed to (Col. 8 Ln. 7 – 18).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Charles E Anya whose telephone number is (703) 305-3411. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:30-5:30) First Friday off.

Art Unit: 2126

The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 746-7239 for regular communications and (703) 746-7240 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Charles E Anya
Examiner
Art Unit 2126

Sue Law